



**STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

RUSSELL J. HARDING, DIRECTOR

**STATE REVOLVING FUND
FINAL INTENDED USE PLAN**

FISCAL YEAR 1997

December 1, 1996

Submitted by:

Thomas L. Kamppinen, Chief

Municipal Facilities Section
Environmental Assistance Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	Page 1
II.	Structure of the SRF	Page 1
III.	Advantages of the SRF	Page 2
IV.	Changes in the SRF	Page 3
V.	Project Priority	Page 4
VI.	Long Term Goals	Page 4
VII.	Short Term Goals	Page 5
VIII.	Allocation of Funds	Page 6
IX.	Assurances	Page 7
X.	Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds	Page 8
XI.	EPA-ACH Activities	Page 9
XII.	Public Review and Comment	Page 9
XIII.	Origination of Documents	Page 10
	Attachments: Flow of Funds	
	Charts 1-4: Project Information	

I. INTRODUCTION

The State of Michigan provides a low-interest loan financing program to assist qualified local municipalities construct needed water pollution control facilities. Michigan's fund is officially known as the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund. Since its inception in 1989, however, the fund has more commonly been referred to as the **Clean Water State Revolving Fund, or SRF**.

Michigan's SRF program is used by local municipalities to finance construction of their water pollution control projects. These may include wastewater treatment plant upgrades or expansions, combined sewer overflow abatement, new sewers designed to reduce existing sources of pollution, nonpoint source pollution management measures and other related wastewater treatment efforts. Qualified municipalities must meet federal and state program requirements as well as demonstrate their ability to publicly finance their project.

The SRF is a state-managed program. This Fiscal Year (FY) 1997 Intended Use Plan (IUP) describes how the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) and the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority (the Authority) will jointly administer the SRF during FY1997. The Municipal Facilities Section (MFS) of the Environmental Assistance Division (EAD) is charged with carrying out the program administration responsibilities. Financial administration of the program continues to be effectively handled by the staff of the Authority. The administrative contacts for the SRF are as follows:

Ms. Janet Hunter Moore, Executive Director
Michigan Municipal Bond Authority
Michigan Department of Treasury
Treasury Building
Lansing, MI 48922
517-373-1728

Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief
Municipal Facilities Section
Environmental Assistance Division
Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30457
Lansing, MI 48909-7957
517-373-2161

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) continues to offer guidance and conduct annual program reviews which strengthen the management of the SRF and helps to ensure consistent application of federal requirements

II. STRUCTURE OF THE SRF

From 1989 through 1992, Michigan's SRF operated as a direct loan program. Municipalities requested reimbursement for project costs and draws were processed directly upon federal and state funds as they were needed. Since 1992, however, the State has sold State Revolving Fund Revenue Bonds which are covered with a reserve drawn directly from federal and state funds. Issuance costs are covered by the bonds sold and, thus, are not identified as direct administrative expenses of the SRF. These costs have historically approximated 1% of the total issue.

Four separate market issues have been sold to date. In 1992, the SRF sold bonds in the amount of \$91,110,100. In 1993, \$102,220,000 in bonds were sold. The third issue, in early 1995, totaled \$87,280,000. The most recent bond sale was concluded in May, 1996 for \$86,290,000. A refinancing of took place in August, 1996. New bonds totaling \$86,750,000 were sold to defease all of the outstanding 1992A and 1994 series bonds. Thus, the defeased series are no longer considered outstanding.

It is from these issues that reimbursements are drawn for the local units of government. Concurrently, the EPA and State funds are deposited into the debt service reserve accounts which provide coverage for the revenue bonds. Diagrams of the flow of funds are included as Attachment 1.

Michigan has requested and received federal capitalization funds from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) since FY1989. This federal contribution has been significant, amounting to over \$540 million dollars to date. These funds, matched by a 20% contribution from State sources, have created the capital pool from which the low-interest loans could be made. In addition, release funds from the reserve accounts become available as coverage requirements lapse on each bond issue sold. These moneys then become available for recommitment to local municipalities.

The following summarizes the yearly capital contributions of both the federal and state governments, as well as municipal repayments expected:

FY	Federal Cap Grant	State Match	Total Cap Grant	Muni. Interest Repay on Loans	Muni. Principal Repay on Loans	Total Available Funds
1989	\$40,556,538	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 48,756,538	\$0	\$0	\$ 48,756,538
1990	\$42,108,599	\$ 8,421,600	\$ 50,530,199	\$ 12,843	\$0	\$ 50,543,042
1991	\$88,244,046	\$17,648,809	\$105,892,855	\$ 410,006	\$ 1,320,000	\$107,622,861
1992	\$83,545,209	\$16,709,042	\$100,254,251	\$1,709,590	\$ 2,415,000	\$104,378,841
1993	\$92,478,548	\$18,495,710	\$110,974,258	\$3,119,213	\$ 6,200,000	\$120,293,471
1994	\$53,595,202	\$10,719,040	\$ 64,314,242	\$4,599,247	\$ 9,915,558	\$ 78,829,047
1995	\$52,961,238	\$10,592,248	\$ 63,553,486	\$6,159,577	\$14,890,794	\$ 84,603,857
1996	\$86,752,116	\$17,350,423	\$104,102,539	\$7,305,184	\$16,823,825	\$128,231,548
TOTALS	\$540,241,496	\$108,136,872	\$648,378,368	\$23,315,660	\$51,565,177	\$723,259,205

In addition, interest from earnings on common cash investments have increased funds available by \$61.4 million.

III. ADVANTAGES OF THE SRF

The primary advantage to Michigan municipalities is the ability to borrow funds at rates well below market rates. Most loans to date were offered with a 2% rate of interest. At the start of FY1995, this was raised to 2.25%. Since the fund's inception, open market rates have ranged from 5.25 to 8 percent. The stability of the SRF has allowed communities to more adequately plan without factoring in major market rate adjustments.

The SRF interest rate is established prior to each new fiscal year. The decision is based on demand, market conditions, program costs, and future structuring needs. Since a portion of the State match may be financed with State Revenue Match bonds, the upcoming year's interest rate must also account for the expense incurred in securing these bonds. After conducting the public hearing and determining the federal contribution to the SRF, the MDEQ director retained the 2.25% rate of interest for all loans offered during FY1997.

Apart from the low interest, municipalities also benefit from the SRF in that they can finance all eligible water pollution control costs. They often do not have to seek other sources or enter the market to obtain local share financing. Everything is handled by this "one-stop shopping" concept. The amount of time it

takes to commence construction is greatly reduced. The streamlined approach has resulted in lower bid costs because of the tighter timeframe. It has removed the unexpected elements that occurred when communities would obtain a grant and then have to secure financing for the local share.

The SRF can also be used to fund qualified projects to abate nonpoint sources of pollution. The MDEQ director may allocate funds between traditional point source projects and the nonpoint sources such as urban and agricultural runoff. There continues to be little interest from local units of government to finance projects for nonpoint source pollution control through the SRF. The impediment continues to focus on the local communities' ability to come up with a viable source of repayments for nonpoint sources.

Over the last year, we have studied programs offered in Ohio, Maryland and Minnesota to determine whether or not Michigan would benefit from instituting a different structure for nonpoint source loans. To best address Michigan's nonpoint source needs, we will commence work during FY1997 on developing a pilot program based on the "linked deposit" concept currently used in Ohio. A possible funding source for an initial pilot program may come from released moneys if we refinance earlier bonds. We believe that this strategy can offer an effective mechanism designed to assist groups of non-municipal stakeholders in their quest for low-interest financing. At this time, however, we will continue to make loans available to any Section 319 point sources project within the fundable range that can meet program requirements.

IV. CHANGES IN THE SRF

A major change that has taken place since last year's Intended Use Plan was published is the switch in administration of the SRF to Michigan's new Department of Environmental Quality. The Municipal Facilities Section was moved into the Environmental Assistance Division of MDEQ. The actual staffing of program/project administration has remained constant through the life of the SRF. However, the grant applicant for capital funding is now awarded to MDEQ. It is anticipated that MFS will also play a major role in future expansion of SRF financing into the Drinking Water program.

Since beginning the SRF, Michigan has counted each project as an equivalency project. Therefore each municipal borrower has been required to comply with all applicable federal Title II requirements. With the lapse of Section 602(b)(6), however, several of these requirements no longer have basis in fact. In reaction to this change at the federal level, the following Title II requirements no longer apply to the SRF:

- Section 201(b): projects apply best practicable waste treatment technology;
- Section 201(g)(1): limits assistance to projects for secondary treatment, advanced treatment, or any cost effective infiltration/inflow correction;
- Section 201(g)(2): requires that alternative technologies be considered in project planning design;
- Section 201(g)(5): requires applicants to study innovative and alternative treatment technologies;
- Section 201(g)(6): requires applicant to analyze the potential recreation/open space opportunities;
- Section 201(n)(1): provides that funds under Section 205 may be used for Combined Sewer Overflow;
- Section 201(o): calls on the states to encourage and assist communities develop capital financing plans;
- Section 204(d)(2): plant owner/operator must certify the facility meets design specifications and effluent limitations included in its permit;
- Section 211: provides that major rehabilitation or replacement of collectors is not eligible;
- Section 513: applies Davis-Bacon labor wage provisions to treatment works construction.

MFS will continue to require cost-effective projects, evaluation of excessive infiltration/inflow, municipal revenue systems demonstrating sufficiency of operating revenues, consistency of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and project inclusion in plans developed under Sections 208 and 303(e) of the Act.

The potential expansion of the SRF into water supply and the language added in the last appropriations measure calling for special assistance for hardship communities will also cause MFS staff to project forward in managing the program. We are prepared to respond within the upcoming year to these new program opportunities as they are more carefully defined on the national level.

V. PROJECT PRIORITY

The State Clean Water Assistance Act, now codified in Part 53, Clean Water Assistance, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994, requires the SRF to offer assistance in priority order from the State's annual Project Priority List (PPL). The criteria used to prioritize the projects are contained in the Act, with details set forth in administrative rules (R323.951 to R323.965).

The final FY1997 IUP and PPL include projects scheduled to receive Orders of Approval (the State's binding commitment) between October 1, 1996 and September 30, 1997. A letter has been sent out which identifies the specific fundable and contingent projects. Attachment 2 sets forth these projects, their expected funding amounts and the dates of expected commitment. Those communities with projects in the fundable range must negotiate a schedule with the MDEQ project manager assigned to assist the local unit of government.

Historically, many projects in the contingency range of the IUP have been funded when others in the fundable range fail to satisfactorily meet program requirements in a timely manner. It is imperative that municipal officials work closely with the MDEQ and the Authority to ensure that no opportunity for funding is lost.

There is no actual, nor implied, guarantee that inclusion on the PPL, the IUP, or in the fundable range will constitute a commitment of financial assistance from the SRF. All program requirements must be satisfied before a binding commitment will be offered and a loan closed.

VI. LONG-TERM GOALS

Michigan's SRF is the primary funding source used to protect and preserve the water resources within the State's boundaries. As more and more attention is given to water pollution abatement efforts within specific watersheds, MDEQ will continue to work toward establishing tighter integration of the federal/state/local partnership.

Protection of the State's waters will ultimately benefit everyone. Industry, tourism, and day-to-day quality of life are strengthened when our most valuable natural asset is preserved for our use and enjoyment. This includes improvement of existing surface waters which suffer impairment, protection of groundwater resources from improperly treated discharges, reduction of harmful discharges from combined sewer overflows, and the protection of aquatic ecosystems which cannot thrive in conditions of degraded water quality. To this end, Michigan's SRF seeks:

- A. To achieve and maintain statewide compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules and standards;**
- B. To protect the public health and environmental quality of our state;**
- C. To develop a linked-deposit financing component of the SRF to provide easier access integrating Section 319 nonpoint source pollution projects into the mainstream of the SRF;**
- D. To further integrate principles of watershed management and water quality restoration within urban, as well as outstate, areas;**
- E. To secure Michigan's full share of federal funding available under Title VI and to expeditiously obligate these moneys, along with the state contributions, for the construction of water pollution control activities which meet state and federal requirements.**
- F. To maintain an effective program of community environmental education, outreach, and involvement within watersheds.**
- G. To develop effective technical assistance strategies to assist smaller, hardship communities meet water quality standards.**

VII. SHORT-TERM GOALS

In order to accomplish the long-term goals, we must also focus on more immediate objectives. Therefore, for our short-term goals for FY1997, we will strive:

- A. To continue on-going revisions to the SRF Procedures Manual. This is a continual process involving staff and management effort to review and redraft chapters to reflect changes in operational procedures of managing the SRF. This will result in improved efficiency and effectiveness of the program;**
- B. Draft legislation to implement a new State Revolving Fund for Drinking Water as a companion program to the Clean Water SRF in Michigan;**
- C. React to need for establishing a small community hardship assistance program and a viable nonpoint source funding vehicle in conjunction with key shareholders;**
- D. To identify and establish a technical assistance program for municipal revenue system development focused on pollution prevention;**
- E. To work with EPA and the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators to promote reauthorization of the federal Clean Water Act and to secure necessary state funds to ensure that Michigan is in position to take advantage of such reauthorization;**
- F. To fund those projects identified in the IUP, enabling them to proceed with construction of facilities included in their adopted project plans.**

VIII. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Allocation of funds among eligible uses is based on a three-step process. First, the MDEQ identifies the sources of funds and the spending limits for the SRF within the given fiscal year. Next, a determination of the type and amount of funding assistance necessary for each community is made. Finally, SRF funds are allocated among the projects consistent with amounts available and the projects' priority standing.

The following information reflects the estimated sources of funds from which communities may draw assistance during FY1997:

FY1997 Title VI Funds	\$26,798,000
FY1997 Section 205(m) Transfer Funds	0
FY1997 State Match	5,360,000
Carryover from previous year	24,432,000
Anticipated Earnings & Funds Released from Debt Service Reserve	52,870,555
Repayments of Principal to SRF	19,000,000
Repayments of Interest to SRF	7,835,000
Total Sources of Funds for FY1997	\$136,295,555

From these funds, however, the costs of administering the SRF are also drawn. As permitted in Section 603(d)(7) of the federal Clean Water Act, Michigan will continue to reserve up to 4% of the cumulative federal capitalization amounts to cover the administrative expenses of operating the SRF. Taking into account allowances for cost overruns which may occur, we anticipate providing up to \$122,666,000 for project funding during FY1997. These funds will be drawn by the MDEQ and the Authority throughout the fiscal year to cover administrative costs and project reimbursements.

IX. ASSURANCES

- A. Legal Basis - The State of Michigan has certified that it established the SRF under Part 53, Clean Water Assistance, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994. Companion administrative rules (R323.951-323.965), along with the Act, grant the necessary powers and authorities to administer the SRF consistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act, applicable regulations, and the Operating Agreement signed in June, 1989.

The State continues to assure that it has the legal, managerial, institutional, and fiscal capability to administer the SRF according to established requirements. Proper attestation from the Michigan Attorney General, signed December 23, 1996, is forwarded with this IUP.

- B. Separate Accounts - The SRF maintains separate accounts dedicated solely to providing assistance in the form of loans. The Authority is responsible for all transactional records of the SRF and prepares separate statements of account. From these accounts loans may be issued to finance construction of Section 212 publicly-owned wastewater treatment works or the implementation of Section 319 nonpoint source programs. Other qualified expenses of the SRF may also be paid.
- C. Expeditious Expenditures - The State will seek to expend **all** funds in the SRF in a timely and expeditious manner (Section 602(b)(4)) and will use it funds first to assure maintenance of progress towards enforceable deadlines, goals, and requirements of the federal act.
- D. Environmental Review - In accordance with Section 602(a) of the Clean Water Act, Michigan has set forth a State Environmental Review Process (SERP) in its administrative rules (R 323.954) and the Operating Agreement entered into by the State and USEPA-Region V.

This process, which impacts all projects funded in Tier I (equivalency projects) of Michigan's SRF, will produce state reviews consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Environmental reviews for communities which receive assistance will be conducted under procedures initially published during FY 1990 and periodically updated since then.

- E. Binding Commitments - In accordance with Section 602(b)(3), the State will enter into binding commitments (Orders of Approval) for 120% of each quarterly payment within 1 year of receipt of that payment.
- F. Federal Cross-cutters - In accordance with procedures identified in the Operating Agreement and for all funds directly made available though federal capitalization grants, the State shall require compliance with "cross-cutting" federal programs listed in Appendix F of the USEPA official guidance.

Each applicant community must certify that it will comply with all federal and/or state laws, regulations, requirements and/or procedures. Many of these are specifically enumerated in both the Application for Assistance and the Supplement Agreement signed upon loan closing.

Federal cross-cutters are divided into four groups: 1) environmental; 2) economic; 3) social legislation; 4) other. Environmental and economic cross-cutters are addressed during review and approval of a project plan. Issues relating to social legislation are dealt with prior to the loan award through applicant certifications and follow-up reporting.

When circumstances dictate, the MDEQ will take necessary steps to ensure compliance, including a request to EPA Region V to intercede in cross-cutter disputes involving other agencies.

If a municipality should fail to achieve compliance with any provision enumerated in law, rules, procedure, or as a special condition, MDEQ may take action leading up to termination of the loan.

- G. National Municipal Policy - The State has previously established that all of the municipalities listed on the National Municipal Policy (NMP) List are in compliance, are under construction, or are involved in an enforcement action which will lead to compliance. There are no known deviations from conditions and/or schedules. Therefore the SRF is not restricted by Section 602(b)(5) for FY1997. The first use requirement is met.

X. CRITERIA AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The State of Michigan will provide financial assistance from the SRF to municipalities in the relative order that they appear on the Project Priority List (PPL) developed for the fiscal year covered by this IUP. It is probable, however, that lower-ranked communities will receive money sooner if higher-ranked communities are not ready to proceed.

Section 5309 of Public Act 451 of 1994 permits the department to limit funding in certain circumstances to maximize funds and achieve greater environmental gains. It reads:

To ensure that a disproportionate share of available funds for a given fiscal year is not committed to a single sewage treatment work project or stormwater project, the department may segment a sewage treatment work project if either of the following criteria is present:

(a) The cost of the proposed project is more than 30% of the amount available in the fund.

(b) Upon application of a municipality, the department has approved a municipality's application for segmenting a project.

MDEQ elects to invoke this clause during FY1997 with the Wayne County-Downriver projects. The IUP and PPL reflect this limitation. Once all other qualified projects on the FY1997 PPL have received financial commitments, any leftover funds will be redistributed in priority order to make whole those projects impacted by the "30 percent" rule.

Financial assistance to municipalities during FY1997 will consist solely of straight loans. There will be no guarantees of indebtedness.

XI. EPA-ACH ACTIVITIES

EPA employs an Automated Clearing House (ACH) to make disbursements of federal funds to the SRF. For FY1997 Michigan anticipates drawing on the ACH according to the following schedule:

1st Qtr -	\$0	
2nd Qtr -	\$24,579,835	Request processing in January, 1997
3rd Qtr -	\$25,000,000	Request processing in May, 1997
4th Qtr -	\$27,961,238	Request processing in August, 1997

As project (or program administrative) costs are incurred, one request for disbursement may be submitted by the local project's authorized representative (or state agencies) each month. The request for disbursement of funds will be sent directly to the MDEQ, who will then process the request as part of a weekly draw request. Upon delivery to its office, the Authority will execute the fund drawdown electronically by transferring money from the federal ACH and State accounts. These amounts are drawn at 83.3 percent and 16.7 percent, respectively.

Moneys will be automatically deposited into the debt service reserve account of the SRF, while funds are electronically wired to the municipality's bank from a SRF account which holds funds from a taxable state issue.

XII. PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

In order to satisfy public participation requirements, MDEQ must conduct a public hearing on the IUP and PPL. This year the public hearing took place on September 19 at 1:30 p.m. in Lansing, MI. This hearing was announced in newspapers throughout the State, individually noticed to each municipality on the proposed FY1997 PPL and sent to interested parties.

Items addressed in the public hearing included Michigan's PPL, IUP, priority point assignment, planned funding schedules and proposed binding commitment amounts for projects which might be assisted with SRF moneys during FY1997. This hearing provided an opportunity for municipalities and other interested parties to comment and request changes to their projects' ranking criteria, if necessary.

The information contained in the accompanying charts will be useful for those interested in reviewing project data. Chart 1 shows the binding commitment dates, construction start dates and binding commitment amounts. Chart 2 provides a breakdown of category cost dollars. Chart 3 reflects the type of assistance, NPDES Permit Number, Facilities Needs Number and whether the project had a previous segment funded within the prior three years. Finally, Chart 4 identifies the quarterly funding breakdown.

Questions about the public hearing, the final PPL, or the final IUP may be directed to:

**Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief - Municipal Facilities Section,
Environmental Assistance Division, Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30457, Lansing, MI 48909
Voice Telephone: 517-373-2161
Fax Telephone: 517-335-0743**

XIII. ORIGINATION OF DOCUMENTS

The Chief of the Municipal Facilities Section of the Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for issuing the Intended Use Plan. The IUP and its accompanying information were prepared by Mr. Edward Moyer. It is a collaborative effort of MFS staff who provide data for its development. Questions specific to the structure or content of text or numbers, may be directed to Mr. Moyer's attention at the address listed above.



MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SECTION, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, PO BOX 30457, LANSING MI 48909-7957 (PHONE: 517-373-2161)

Michigan Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund
Loan Assistance Ranking For Wastewater Treatment Works Projects

FINAL Fiscal Year 1997 Project Priority List By Rank

Rank	Project Number	Project Name And Description			Water Quality Severity Points						Enf Pts	Pop.	Pop. Pts	Exist. Disch	Recvg. Waters	Dil. Ratio	Rat. Pts	Tot Pts	Bind.Com Date	Bind.Com. Amt.
					DO	NUT	TOX	MICR	GWD	Tot										
PROJECTS WITH PRIOR FUNDED SEGMENTS W/ LAST 3 YEARS																				
1	5117-23	Wayne Co	Downriver	Jackson St Pump Station Connection	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	02/27/97	\$2,250,000
	5117-24	Wayne Co	Downriver	Lower Tunnel	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	08/28/97	\$4,205,000
	5117-25	Wayne Co	Downriver	Tunnel Dewatering Pump Station	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	08/28/97	\$4,205,000
	5117-26	Wayne Co	Downriver	Allen Park Local Relief Sewers	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	02/27/97	\$10,560,000
	5117-27	Wayne Co	Downriver	Dearborn Heights Local Relief Sewers	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	05/27/97	\$8,590,000
	5117-28	Wayne Co	Downriver	Romulus Local Relief Sewers	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	08/28/97	\$1,800,000
	5117-29	Wayne Co	Downriver	Southgate Local Relief Sewers	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	05/27/97	\$1,350,000
	5117-30	Wayne Co	Downriver	Taylor Local Relief Sewers	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	05/27/97	\$5,090,000
	5117-31	Wayne Co	Downriver Wyandotte	Low-Lift Pump Station	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	08/28/97	\$3,510,000
	5117-32	Wayne Co	Downriver	Future Segments	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	09/09/99	\$99,915,000
2	5099-04	Dearborn	Wayne Co	Seg 4 CSO: Future	66	40	0	27	0	133	300	46403	90	0.554	3.8	0.1458	85	608	09/09/99	\$76,350,000
3	5110-02	Wayne	Wayne Co	Seg 2 CSO: EQ Basin	13	2	0	27	0	42	300	6508	80	0.072	3	0.0240	70	492	02/27/97	\$940,000
4	5129-02	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	CSO: Swr Sep-Future Segments	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	7950	80	0.043	78000	0.0000	25	433	09/09/99	\$13,610,000
	5129-06	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	CSO: Swr Sep-Portage & Ferris Sts	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	7950	80	0.043	78000	0.0000	25	433	08/28/97	\$800,000
PROJECTS WITHOUT PRIOR FUNDED SEGMENTS W/ LAST 3 YEARS																				
5	5005-09	Lansing	Ingham Co	Seg 9 CSO: Swr Sep	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	02/27/97	\$7,000,000
	5005-10	Lansing	Ingham Co	CSO: Swr Sep - Future Segments	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	09/09/99	\$154,000,000
6	5126-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	PC 693-Dechlorination	0	0	50	0	0	50	300	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	520	08/28/97	\$6,035,000
7	5140-01	Wayne Co	Wayne Co HVN	Lift Station 1A	13	0	0	27	0	40	300	370700	100	0.054	3.8	0.0142	70	510	05/27/97	\$6,590,000
8	5135-01	Saginaw	Saginaw Co	CSO: Emerson Phase B Coll Swr	1	8	0	27	0	36	300	3126	70	6.883	2200	0.0031	55	461	02/27/97	\$2,720,000
9	5131-01	Monroe Co	Carleton	Upgrd/Expnd WWTP -(Oxy Ditch)	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3007	70	0.286	1.1	0.2600	85	455	05/27/97	\$7,010,000
10	5120-01	Ontonagon	Ontonagon Co	Slab Lag, Swr Rehab	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	2042	60	0.019	710	0.0000	25	413	02/27/97	\$5,065,000
11	5102-01	Bay Co	Essexville	WWTP Impr, Expnd RTB, Enclose Outfall	0	3	0	4	0	7	300	4006	75	0.13	980	0.0001	25	407	02/27/97	\$3,150,000
12	5144-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	Exp. Chlorination Facility	0	0	0	27	0	27	0	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	197	08/28/97	\$4,080,000
13	5134-01	Warren	Wayne Co	Sludge Handling Impr @ WWTP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144864	95	96.753	0.4	241.822	100	195	05/27/97	\$10,030,000
14	5103-01	Flint	Genesee Co	WWTP Upgrd:PS:(add sludge equip from 5137)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140775	95	50	85	0.5882	85	180	08/28/97	\$8,245,000
15	5130-01	Mason	Ingham Co	WWTP Exp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7684	80	3	1.6	1.8749	100	180	09/09/99	\$3,650,000
16	5093-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	PC 648-Roof Top Matl Handling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	170	09/09/99	\$3,150,000
17	5125-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	PC 692-SFE Pumps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	170	02/27/97	\$3,500,000
18	5143-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	Second Detroit River Outfall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3100000	100	2.6	650	0.0040	55	155	08/28/97	\$30,720,000
19	5138-01	Livingston Co	Hamburg Twp	WWTP (SBR)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3370	70	0.12	1.6	0.0750	85	155	02/27/97	\$4,075,000
20	5013-01	Oakland Co	Brandon Twp	CS: FM: WWTP	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	3310	70	0.232	999999	0.0000	25	145	08/28/97	\$13,200,000
21	5141-01	Kent City	Kent co	Swr Rehab: WWTP Impr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	50	0.17	1.7	0.1000	85	135	05/27/97	\$2,020,000
22	5139-01	Billings Twp	Gladwin Co	Grav/Press CS: Oxy. Ditch w/Wetland Dis.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3429	70	0.24	999999	0.0000	25	95	08/28/97	\$22,990,000